STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Us Intervention in Panama

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, the Minister for External Affairs will make a statement.

[**The Deputy Chairman** in the Chair.]

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदया, हिन्दी का स्टेटमेंट कहां है । जब तक हिन्दी नहीं आता आप कार्यवाही स्थगित रखिए ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wait for five minutes. Otherwise, there will be confusion in the House.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: (Uttar Pradesh): I have got a point to make. The statement has crossings and cuttings. They have crossed a line and cut a paragraph. Is this how a statement should be presented to the House?

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : इसको ठीक करके लाएं । ...(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me see the statement. I have not got the statement yet.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): One line has been cut and one paragraph has been crossed. Is it the way this Government is going to function?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

आपने सवाल उठाया उसका जवाब भी सुनिए । यह स्टेटमेंट जो मंत्री जी ने दिया था, मंत्रालय से उसमें कुछ लास्ट मिनट में चेन्जेज हुए । सेक्रिटेरियेट ने उसको छापा और उसकी फोटो कापी आपको बांटी । जो मंत्री जी बोलेंगे वही ऑथेंटिक होगा, आप उसी को सच चुनिए ...(**व्यवधान**) इतना गुस्सा मत कीजिए । Let him speak. Then he can explain as to why the cutting is there. I do not know what he has cut out.

SHRI M. M. JACOB (Kerala): The sentence used there is not here.

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया (बिहार) : यह जो लिखा गया है और फिर मिटाया गया है इसकी इन्फरमेशन कहां से आयी और इसको छिपाने की कोशिश क्यों की जा रही है, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं । (**व्यवधान**)

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): Madam, if I have your permission to make a submission, I deeply regret the inconvenience caused to the Members.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): We want to know why it was cut out.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): You can seek a clarification after the statement is made.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: No, no.

(*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Old habits die had. Mr. Dipen Ghosh will take some time...(*Interruptions*) Let the Minter speak.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय : दीपेन घोष को मिनिस्टर बना दीजिए ।

उपसभापति : मेरे हाथ में होता तो मैं सब को मिनिस्टर बना देती । (**व्यवधान**)

Now, let him speak.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Madam, Chairperson, around 1130 hours Indian Stan-

[Shri I. K. Gujral]

dard Time on December 20, the US troops commenced military action in Panama. According to an official US Government spokesman, President Bush ordered US military forces into Panama in order to "protect American lives, restore the democratic process, preserve the integrity of the Panama Canal treaties and to apprehend General Manuel Antonio Noriega."

According to reports available until, now, US military... (*Interruptions*)... action in Panama is continuing and fighting has not as yet ended.

The Government of India has been deeply concerned at US armed intervention in Panama and deplores the action. We also regret that the action has led to loss of innocent lives in Panama.

As the House is aware, India is fully committed to uphold the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and non-use of force for settlement of disputes. India has always maintained that negotiation is the best way for arriving at peaceful settlement of disputes and that applies equally to the situation in Panama in Central America. Our position is also consistent with the United Nations Charter to which all members of the UN have subscribed.

It is the hope of the Government of India that the US armed intervention will end soon and American forces will be withdrawn quickly.

I am sure the House will wish that in Panama it will be possible for the people to establish the democratic process.

The internal situation in Panama is still confuing and we are in touch with our Ambassador. When last reports were received from him, fighting was still going on in the streets near our Chancery. I am pleased to inform the House that all members of the Mission are safe. Our Mission has so far received no report of any loss of life as far as Indian nationals in Panama are concerned. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER (Gujarat): Madam, Deputy Chairman, I regret for a very insipid statement that has been made on behalf of the Minister for External Affairs. (*Interruption*) I will just say why it is insipid. The first paragraph only refers to what the official US Government's spokesman had said. Then, when it comes to the second paragraph, they said that according to reports available until now, US military action in Panama is continuing. And the same burden of song you will kindly find in paragraph 7 where they say that 'the fighting was still going on in the streets near our Chancery.' And they say in paragraph 5 that "it is the hope of the Government of India that the US intervention will end soon and American forces will be withdrawn quickly." What does that mean? After the entire annihilation takes place, then you are hoping that U.S. armed intervention will stop and America will withdraw the forces, after everything is over. What is the attitude of the Government of India? You do not even condemn that action. What is your policy in regard to this? You are only having a pious hope. And after everything is over, what is the purpose? After all, the Government has got to act. And the Government must come forth with its policy angle. And, where do you stand? Do you want to subscribe to the American Government's approach? Or would you merely keep quiet by having a pious hope which he would like to have. This is a serious matter. We cannot leave the matter like this. The Government seems to be rudderless. The Government does not seem to have any thinking on this issue at all. This is most unfortunate and I would expect the Minister of External Affairs to clarify these points.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Madam Chairperson, it is a dangerous situation and it is dangerous because American troops have invaded Panama. This is downright invasion. Let there be no doubt about it. The Government should not put words in a way which dilutes the whole thing. The Government should call it aggression. If the Government does not want to call aggression, at least the Government should say it is interference, downright interference in the internal affairs of Panama.

In the very first paragraph of the statement there is a quotation from a spokesman of the American Administration. Why should the Foreign Minister's statement or the Government of India's statement contain a quotation from a foreign spokesman. In fact, that becomes some sort of a so attitude. There is no reason why he should quote. We should straightaway say that American troops have invaded Panama and Panama is an independent country as India is. (*Interruptions*). Don't tell me all this. I know on a number of previous occasions the Government used much diluted statemtents. Don't do it. (*Interruptions*). Madam, will I be allowed to speak?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, you speak. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, it is shocking, it is extremely shocking that a quotation has been included from a spokesman of the American Government. Why has there been no reference to a statement, if there is any, of a representative of the Government of Panama? Panama has been invaded. The drug trafficking cannot be an alibi for sending American troops to Panama. And this is not a question of bilateral issue. Invasion of a country cannot be allowed to be a bilateral issue. It is not a bilateral issue. If America has anything to say, there can be no question of sending troops there. Panama has been invaded. This is not the first example of America's naked invasion. What happened in Chile, we know. We know how Allende was murdered. We know how Lumumba was murdered. We know how the Falkland island was invaded by the British. We know that at least fourteen times American imperialism has invaded other countries. Therefore, it is a downright case of imperialist aggression and intervention. It cannot be a dispute between two countries. India must demand withdrawal. The pious wish of the Minister shall fall flat on the ears of American imperialists. The Government of India should demand immediate withdrawal. The Government of India amust demand that the President of Panama is restored to his right ful place. The Government of India must demand that there cannot be any alibi for sending troops there.

Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether any protest note has been sent. There must be a protest note. Merely a statement in response to a Special Mention cannot meet the requirements in regard to this issue. There must be a protest note. If any protest note has been sent, what is the content of that purpose note?

I wish, the new Government which has taken over handles the issue of foreign affairs with firmness. India is not a weak nation. On the question of foreign policy, the whole country is united. Therefore, on the question of foreign policy, I wish, the Government is more firm, the Government becomes more unequivocal and calls a spade a spade. America has been threatening our country also. The best traditions of the Indian national movement calls for a downright condemnation, protesting against it and describing it an interference in the internal affairs of Panama. Supposing, there is a problem in regard to India and Pakistan. Supposing, Pakistan sends its troops to solve the problem of drug trafficking in India. What would be our reaction? Now, Pakistan is helping the terrorists. Supposing, India sends its troops to solve this problem. What will be the reactions? Therefore, merely alibi of tackling the problem of drug trafficking cannot be a pretext for condoning, or, appearing in a soft way towards, the armed aggression.

Panama is not a Communist country. But as a Communist, I feel that the question of nationalism, the question of democracy, the question of the Constitution and the question of the best traditions of the national movement should be held aloft by everybody. I wish, the Government becomes more straight, categorical and unequivocal. They must condemn this aggression, they must demand the withdrawal of the U.S. troops and they must say whether any protest note has been sent.

SHRI VISHVAJIT P. SINGH (Maharashtra): Thank you, Comrade.

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala): Thank you, Madam Deputy Chairman, for permitting me to seek clarifications on the statement of the hon. Minister of External Affairs. Madam, with the kind permission of the Chairman, I had an opportuity to raise this matter in this august House this morning.

Before I seek specific clarifications, I would like to recall that in our country, fortunately, we have a broad consensus in the matter of our foreign policy. This broad consensus on foreign policy was nurtured in the crucible of our anti-imperialist freedom struggle. This broad consensus that we have in relation to our foreign policy is not the creation of some individuals or some parties. But it was, and it is, the result of the strenuous struggle that we waged against British imperialism. This all of us know.

Therefore, when we discuss matters in regard to our foreign policy, we should not try to score political points. With this as the background, while welcoming the statement made by the hon. Minister of External Affairs, I feel,—as we have a broad consensus in the matter of foreign policy—this statement requires some modification to make this statement more unequivocal. Therefore, we need not have to say that we are more firm, that this Party is more firm, that the other Party is less firm and things like that. As I mentioned, we have a broad, general, consensus. My colleague from the Left just now made certain points. I generally agree with him. But when we try to make these points, my humble submission is that we should not try to say—we should not try to make ourselves appear—that we are more progressive or revolutionary.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: who are you camouflaging? *(Interruptions)* in the morning, you were speaking with so much aggression. Now, you have changed. *(Interruptions)*

6..00 p.m

SHRI M. A. BABY: This is precisely what pains me. *(Interruptions)* So far as my party is concerned, whether it was the Congress (I) Government or it is the present Janata Dal Government, the National Front Government...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): Here is a press note wherein the Government has said that there is a ruling Janata Dal. You can check it up.

SHRI M. A. BABY: Let us discuss that on some other occasion.

Whenever some manifestations, prevarications or vaccilations appeared we used to come forward with our firm position. In this case also I feel that the U.S. action has to be described as 'invasion' and almost all the national dailies have reported the U.S. action as an invasion.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Be brief. I have got 19 names.

SHRI M. A. BABY: I am trying to be brief. *(Interruptions)*. Madam, my time is being taken not by invasion but interruption from the other side *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You know, there is no time-limit. It is for me to allow. So, please be brief.

SHRI M. A. BABY: Quoting PTI, Associated Press and Writer, almost all the national dailies have termed the U.S. action as 'invasion'. So, I feel that it would be better if instead of mentioning it as the U.S. action, the word 'action' is replaced by the word 'invasion'.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Be clear whether 'may be' or 'should be' *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Madam, a serious matter is being discussed and...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is seeking a clarification. Let everybody give his own view.

SHRI M. A. BABY: Secondly, Madam, we should demand through this statement that we want immediate withdrawal of US troops from Panama this must be there. Therefore, we should see the US invasion of Panama in the background of the global policy that is being pursued by

US imperialism. The country as a whole is unanimous in condemning the US action whenever it invaded or attacked or intervened in the affairs of other countries. With this consensus we should go forward.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Subramanian Swamy. (*Interruptions*). There is no point of order. Let us not waste time. I have names of 20 to 25 Members who want to seek clarifications. What point of order can be there?

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY (West-Bangal): Madam, my point of order is this. Whenever this sort of statement is made by a Minister, the Members are supposed to seek clarifications from him. They are never allowed to advise the Minister to redraft the statement. Here Member are supposed to seek clarifications from the Minister.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, you assured the House ... (*Interruptions*). I am genuinely non-aligned. I am not worried whether the Soviets invade Afghanistan or the Americans invade Panama. It is all the same to me. It is only you who are in difficulty today.

Madam, you had assured the House that the Minister would clarify why he gave such a sloppy, untidy and scratched-out statement.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, I did not.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: In the history of Parliament I do not think such a poorly typed, scratched-out statement has been given by a Minister, of all the Ministries in the External Affairs Ministry. Why have these things been cut out? That has not been explained. I would like the Minister to explain why he has cut out those portions.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If he wanted to speak it, he would not have cut it out.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: But he cannot do like this. This is Parliament of India. This is not a third year municipal school where you can scratch out what you like. (*Interruptions*) Madam, they are in a dilemma—these left people—and they do not know what to do. (*Interruptions*) Don't foist your dilemma on me. I am not in a dilemma. I know exactly what my position is. Madam, can you silence them? They should first go to the National Front Government and clarify.

Now, Madam, I had earlier in the morning exprssed serious reservations and doubts about the capacity of this National Front Government to stand up to the United States. I had said that there are enough indications of that. Now the Sri Lankan policy has also demonstrated that the Government of India—the National Front Government—is going to follow the US line on Sri Lanka. That has been clearly demonstrated.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing Sri Lanka. You come to Panama. You speak about Panama.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I am saying in the context...When the genuine members of the Government are silently listening, why are these people jumping up and down? I am not able to understand this. It must be their embarrassment...You just keep quiet and listen.

The same thing I noticed when a junior officer from the US Government recently came, the Assistant Secretary of State, who is of the rank of about Joint Secretary in India, he was able to see the Prime Minister. The protocol was thrown to the winds. According to my information, even the External Affairs Ministry ...I am coming to that. It is in the context of the statement. Madam, why are they speaking on behalf of the Government? You please tell them not to speak on behalf of the Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. He has the right to speak. You cannot dictate to him. Mr. Hanumantha Rao, you cannot dictate any member what he should speak. It is his right to speak. Similarly, I would not like him to disturb you.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Right, Madam. In Soviet Russia, democratisation is taking place, but the Indian Communist Party is, like a museum piece, sticking to the earlier dictatorial approach. Now you kindly keep quiet. You have made your point. Your embarrassment is clear. I understand your embarrassment. Now you please keep quiet. (*Interruptions*) The point I want to make is that every action of this Government shows that they are unable to...Look at this. What is the matter with you? You do not know Parliamentry etiquette ! What is this?

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: They are constantly interrupting him.

SHRI SYED SIBTEY RAZI (Uttar Pradesh): They are behaving as if they are sitting on the Opposition benches.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I have never heard something like this. It is totally unparliamentary, what they are doing. Might be, they have a stomach-ache. But that does not mean that they should take it out on me.

Now, I was saying that a junior officer, the Assistant Secretary of State, came here in advance, without, according to me, the knowledge of the External Affairs Ministry and had an appointment with the Prime Minister. Did he come to get a clearance from the Indian Government on what they were going to do in Panama? I would like to know whether the Assistant Secretary who came here and met the Prime Minister, I do not know through the good offices of whom, informed the Government of India at that time, which is only about a week ago, that they were planning this action in Panama.

Secondly, I would like to know from the Government why they are not able to call an invasion an invasion. What is this "intervention"?

AN HON. MEMBER: Very good.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Now you are saying "very good", but at the time Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, you wanted to say that it was intervention. Now you want to call this in Panama as an invasion. At least, our stand is consistent. The Soviet action in Afghanistan was an invasion, and this also is a gross invasion, and I would like the Government to come out openly and say that.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Who supported it?...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Please control him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Das Gupta, please sit down. You have had your say...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I am expressing my view. I neither want Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta's certificate nor anybody else's certificate. The point is, this is the stand I took at that time and this is the stand I take now--that the United States has violated every single clause of the UN Charter and is engaged in a gross, blatant, invasion of Panama. This House should condemn it in case the Government has not the guts to do it.

Finally, I would like to know why the Indian Government is not demanding immediate withdrawal of the American troops from Panama and what is it that is making them so, shall I say, circumspect. What are they so concerned about the United States' sentiments that they only talk about "deplore and regret." I can understand "regret" if somebody has died. If your aunty has died, we can express regrets. But an invasion has taken place and they say, "We regret it." Why can't they openly come out and say, like the non-aligned nations are doing one after the other?

SHRI MAKHAN LAL FOTEDAR (Uttar Pradesh): They will be thrown out.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Yes. I think, with the tilt towards the United States, of his Government, Mr. Gujral will have great difficulty in continuing. But I would like to know why this Government is not able to say what the other non-aligned countries are saying, namely, that they condemn this action and demand immediate withdrawal. I would

like a satisfactory answer from the Minister on this.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Madam, to say the least, the statement which has been laid on the Table of the House by the External Affairs Minister is simply shocking, shocking for every man, every Indian who has a sense of honour, who has a sense of self-respect and who is committed to the cause of non-intervention by the Super Powers in weaker nations. Madam, is it a Government of India or is it a satellite Government of the Bush Administration? This is the first question I would like to ask. All the nations who opposed it all throughout, but the Government of India took an attitude which is the attitude of an extremely supine, extremely spineless and extremely weak. Government which seems to go back upon all that we stood for devoulty and vehemently all these years. Is there a reversal of policy?—I would like to ask And it comes from an External Affairs Minister like Mr. Gujral who was at one time known to be a vehement supporter of all those who fought forces of imperialism. What has happened to you, Mr. Gujral? Is it that for a Ministership you have bartered away your conscience like this? I would have been very happy if you had agreed to resign rather than read a statement like this on the floor of the House. That is because of my personal respect for Mr. Gujral.

Madam, there are a few things written here and cut out, I do not know whether it was by design or by accident. Whether a particular leader of a particular country is a criminal or not, whether a bunch of people who are working in a Government are criminals or not, it is not for any other country to decide. It is the the people of that country and that country alone, who must take a decision. Who is the United States to sit in judgement as to what sort of a Government they are going to have in Panama? This is a basic, fundamental, principle which we stood for all these years—enunciated by Pandit Nehru right up to Rajiv Gandhi—and this time we are given this kind of a statement. To say the least, Madam, if I went to the international community with it, I would be ashamed of Mr. Gujral, I would be ashamed of his Government, I would be ashamed of myself being an Indian. It is a disgrace—unmitigated disgrace—which is sought to be heaped on this nation by this kind of a statement. I would like to know why there is this plenty of platitude. Mr. Gujral, is it or is it not a sheer aggression? You are writing here that by an arrangement there were 13,000 troops there, and, therefore, 10;000 more were sent. Aren't you ashamed that there were already 13,000 which was bad enough? You are seeking to give justification for another 10,000 having been sent. What has happened, Madam? I am really unable to understand that in two or three weeks' time we have changed so much. Have we sold away our self-respect? Have we sold away all those values for which our people have fought, Jawaharlal Nehru has fought, Indira Gandhi has fought, Rajiv Gandhi has fought, the nation has fought all these years?

SHRI JAGESH DESAI : We never compromised.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Madam, the spokesman of the White House could not have improved upon this kind of a statement. What a disgraceful commentary it is on the working of this Government !

May I, therefore, know in the end whether or not this is a naked aggression, aggression on a country which is weak and whether or not the Government is going to condemn and condemn in unequivocal words and ask for withdrawal of the forces forthwith and toe the line of those who have been oppressed all these years, the weak nations? You have been champions of the nations who have been invaded. You have stood for the cause of those who have been oppressed. What has happened to you? What is your problem? Are you looking up to them for help? What are you looking up to them? Please, for God's sake, do not barter away for your personal interest or the interest

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

of your Government, the national interest and the interest of those who have looked up to you as the greatest champion of those who were invaded.

Thank you, Madam.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY): May I say, there is no personal interest involved in this. It is only in the national interest.

SHRI VISHVAJIT P. SINGH: Why don't you condemn it?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): I do not want to speak on behalf of my colleague. Just I would like to draw the attention of the House to the words used here. Just a minute.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Who has to reply? Is he the concerned Minister?

SHRI VISHVAJIT P. SINGH: He is the leader of the House. He should be allowed to speak.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I am not speaking on his behalf. Just I am drawing the attention of the House to these words:

> 'The Government of India has been deeply concerned at US armed intervention in Panama and deplored the action."

These are the words.

SHRI VISHVAJIT P. SINGH: Is that all you have to say? You should be ashamed of yourself.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: May I just make one submission? In the same breath I would have expected you to read paragraph 5.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Madam Deputy Chairman, just two days back the President in his Address to the two Houses of Parliament said on behalf of V. P. Singh Government, "My Government will further build upon the new trends of constructive and co-operative relationship with the United States." The statement that we have before us today, Madam, comes immediately after that. And if this Government is the Government of promise, as they proclaim, this is the promise that they have fulfilled. True to what they have said to expand co-operation, they have today in a way okayed the act of aggression of the United States. The leadership of the country, Madam, right from Pt. Nehru's days has given a direction, has given credibility and respect to the non-aligned movement. And today with one stroke the new Government has demolished our credibility in the world.

Madam, they claim to be an open Government, I would like to know whether in the statement that has been circulated to us the last sentence in the first paragraph which has been scored off was not in the inverted commas. It was apparently not what Bush is said to have said. It was a sort of a feeling of our Government, the Government of the day in the country. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether at any point of time his Government subscribed to this view that General Manuel Antonio Noriega was under some indictment for drug taffick-ing in the United States and what led them to form this opinion...and what steps the Government would take immediately to undo the harm that they have done to the national honour by Toeing the American live in this regard?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: The United States has for long been treating the Central American region as its backyard. It was Grenada. Earlier it was Cuba. One after the other they have been walking in and out of these small countries and literally imposing their regimes as and when it suited them.

Many have raised this question before, but I would like also to ask the hon. Minister why this Government has hesitated to term an invasion an invasion? There are no two opinions about it. I would like that the Minister clarifies the Government's stand whether they still think that it is not an invasion and what their definition of invasion in that case would be.

I would also like to ask you, hon. Minister, whether it is a fact that the Non-Aligned Bureau has already met and condemned this as an invasion and the Government's statement was after the Non-Aligned Bureau had taken a stand, because they felt that they were being isolated. After it was raised in the House and after the Non-Aligned Bureau had taken its stand, the Government of India suddenly decided that they had to take a stand, because otherwise it was going to be isolated in the Non-Aligned Movement, of which, Madam Deputy Chairperson, we have been proud leaders in the past. We have come to a stage where because of their vacillation we are going to be isolated and they have now come to Parliament.

I am sorry to say this but I think the first paragraph is a justification, if not a mild acceptance, of the US stand rather than condemnation. They start by quoting why Bush sent the forces in, that the US Government spokesman said "President Bush ordered US military forces in order to protect American lives, restore the democratic process," according to their norms I suppose, "and preserve the integrity of the Panama Canal." In other words, instead of a downright terminology of invasion and a condemnation, the Statement begins with a justification for the reasons for the American troops going there.

Madam Deputy Chairperson, the second paragraph, as an after-thought, they have cut out simply because probably they have come to know one way or the other that there are many more troops than what they have claimed in the Statement originally; that many many more are in the process of landing and they realise now that they have been fooled with these figures, because I know that they have many many more troops already landed there than the 13,000 which they have mentioned. They have now at the last minute cut it out knowing that they will be cornered about producing wrong figures in Parliament.

Madam Deputy Chairperson, in para 6, they speak about "will end soon and will be withdrawn quickly." What is the meaning of 'soon' and 'quickly' when it comes to invasion? It either stops or it continues.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the President is alive, has been kidnapped, has been taken away to the United States to face the trial which they have talked about earlier or whether he has got any information about his whereabouts.

Madam Deputy Chairperson, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether we have lodged a protest on behalf of the Government of India with the United States and made our stand clear : that we accept nothing less than an unqualified withdrawal, an immediate withdrawal of foreign troops frm the territory of Panama in keeping with our commitment of respecting the national integrity and independence of the small countries.

Finally Madam Deputy Chairperson, I would like to ask, here in para 6 he mentions "I am sure the House will wish that in Panama it will be possible for the people to establish democratic process". What does he mean by the people restoring democratic processes? Is it under US troop presence? Is it under the regime to be appointed by the United States? What is their intention in saying "We wish the democratic processes will be restored"? Is he trying to say that there were no democratic processes in Panama and so the United States has got to go in there to teach them democratic processes? We know the United States stand, they have only propped up the most oppressive dictatorship wherever they have had a chance. And are you trying to tell us that you believe that the United States is going to build a democratic process in Panama just because your statement hoped that this will happen in the near future, sometime after perhaps half the population has been butchered.

Madam, I would finally say, nothing less than a condemnation and terming of this action as an invasion will satisfy

this House and satisfy the people of this country. We cannot backtrack on this, no matter what their commitments to the USA administration may be. This is the voice of the people of this country and it will not accept this. Thank you, Madam.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Otherwise, the Rajya Sabha itself should pass a condemnation resolution.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I congratulate the hon. Minister for External Affairs for coming out with a statement on "US intervention in Panama" within such a short period of notice. My opinion is that from that side when they were in power I did not get such a quick response. The Minister has categorically stated this as a an intervention. Our position is also consistent with the United Nations stand. Definitely our Government is also against the intervention. We condemn the intervention ... (*Interruptions*)... If you read in between the lines everything will appear same for you.. (*Interruptions*)..You people never condemned USA as an imperialist country in the past. How is it that you got so much enamoured about the statemnet made here.... (*Interruptions*)..

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: You have to read in between the lines.. (*Interruptions*)..

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: You are doing this.. (*Interruptions*).. It is absolutely absurd. The American aggression has always been in the Panama Canal. Every nation in South America is very much concerned about Americans' approach. They want to occupy the Panama Canal. If this situation continues, then, there will be a civil war and it will be a long-drawn-out process. America cannot vanquish the people of Panama, as it has said, in hours or days. That is why it is a continuous process. People of Panama must get their suzerainty over the canal. This is the bone of contention. I want to know from the hon. Minister, what steps he will take to establish peace in Panama. I also want to know what action he is going to take to mobilise international opinion. We do not know whether America is going to withdraw from Panama. I want clarifications from the Minister on each of these aspects.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Anand Sharma. I have got too many names. I think, some of the names I am going to withdraw... (*Interruptions*) ... We cannot ask the whole House to speak.

श्री राम चन्द्र विकल : मेरा नाम सबसे पहले गया है ।

उपसभापति : आप जरा बैठिए । स्थान ग्रहण कीजिए । आप बैठिए तो ... (**व्यवधान**) ... आप तशरीफ तो रखिए ... (**व्यवधान**) ... गुस्सा मत कीजिए ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is entirely up to the Chair to allow any number of people. It is not necessary for me to accept all the names that you send. If you send hundred names, I am not going to call the hundred people.. (*Interruption*). It is all right. But still I am not going to call all the people. No, I am sorry (*Interruptions*).. Shri Anand Sharma.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): I will request you to call more people from the Congress (I).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will call you now.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, as far as the statement of the External Affairs Minister is concerned, I think, there is more anguish and less of anger because it is less than two weeks when this Government took over and they required only this much of time to dilute India's principal stand on international affairs and with one stroke, the first statemnt this Government had to make, it has lowered the prestige of India in the non-aligned movement, in the third world. Madam, I agree entirely with Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta and Mr. M. A. Baby that there has been a broad consensus as far as India's foreign

policy is concerned and this policy has evolved during the course of the freedom struggle and the contribution of the previous Government and the party to which I belong, is a part of history and it cannot be brushed aside. I just take strong objection to the reference that earlier also such mild statements had been made. I would like to draw the attention of this House to the fact that when the U.S. forces had attacked Libya, India had condemand it in unequivocal terms (*Interruptions*)...I was a Member of this House.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have gone through the file. It was not condemned.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: No, it was ..(*Interruptions*).. Madam, invasion of Grenada's was condemned.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: No, it was not condemned but deplored.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I stand by my word.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The word used was deplored.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I contest that. I do not accept that statement because I had participated personally in these two debates. I can clearly recollect that along with other non-aligned countries, India took up the question of U.S. invasion or attack of Libya at the United Nations. India was the first country to take it up at the United Nations and Madam, I would not like to repeat what has been said by other colleagues but as far as the shape of the statement, is concerned, I am not at all surprised. It in fact, reflects the utter confusion which prevails in their mind because they do not know which party will accept which sentence and which party will reject which sentence. It is their problem because the Communists would like outright condemnation and there are others who may not like it. That is their internal problem. But that should not, in fact, come in the way of strong expression of the wishes of the people of this country--the form of statement which comes from the Government of India. This statement says that we accept and rightly so the U.N. Charter and also the existence of Panama as a sovereign nation-State. Then, why we are scared of terming it as an invasion and condemning it? I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government propose to take up this matter at the United Nations and along with other non-aligned countries, co-sponsor a resolution in the U.N. General Assembly, condemning unequivocally this act of the United States of America and demanding withdrawal of U.S.troops from that country. Also in view of what Shrimati Margaret Alva has said that the Minister should clarify whether the Non-aligned Bureau has met and condemned the U.S. action and if the Government was aware of it, it is a matter of shame that India has distanced itself from the NAM position and taken a stand contrary to that. Thank you.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR (Bihar): Madam, this is the first occasion when this Government has been asked to react to an action of a super-power. The Prime Minister and the Government spokesmen have, from time to time, said that the foreign policy is emerging out of national consensus and there was some evidence that there would be continuity of that But, does the statement that the Minister has made, and particularly the spirit in which it has been made, amount to the beginning of the end of that consensus? If that amounts to the beginning of the end of that consensus, I must say, it is a sad day. We know what has happened in Panama in the name of Canal Treaty, in the name of protection of Americans. The fact remains that there were sufficient numbers of U.S. troops stationed there and on top of it, according to press reports, over 20,000 troops, including the 82nd airborne division and members of Delta Special Forces, flew into US bases and spread out subsequently. There were already tensions between two countries (*Interruptions*). The question is not whether somebody is a drug-trafficker or not. The issue before us is whether the United States Government is justified in invading a neighbouring coun--

[Shri Chandresh P. Thakur]

try and whether it is justified in sending its armed forces in the name of a treaty obligation because if that act is condoned, it will have an encouragement to similar adventures in parts of other countries and it could be just next-door of India because one of our neighbours has a treaty arrangement with the United States of America. Is there a possibility that in a situation, Pakistan wants to make an adventurous stop..(*Interruptions*). Madam, the Minister is not interested.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member wants the attention of the Minister. Please do not disturb the Minister, (Interruptions). Mr. Anand Sharma, pleas go back. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Madam, the Minister is not responding to what you are saying. It is still more serious. That shows the contempt they hold for the House and the Chair.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: Madam, there is a saying: My mind is made up. Don't confuse me with facts. Does it amount to the fact that the Minister has made up his mind and the Government has made up its mind and come out with whatever statement it liked and is not willing to listen to whatever we have to say, in the name of national consensus and continuity of the foreign policy of India which we have evolved over forty years in this country after Independence and which has a much longer heritage during the freedom struggle itself? Madam, the fact remains...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please be brief.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR: The Government is showing ignorance with regard to the extent of the invasion in terms of the number of troops and its composition in terms of the quality of the arsenal involved. Further, the Government of the United States of America has made a statement that foreign heads of governments were contacted. I would like to know whether India is one of those countries whose heads had been contacted so far as this invasion of Panama is concerned and if India was contacted, did the Government of India consent or connive in this act of the United States of America? Further, if the Government has been informed that in the name of the defence of the treaty obligation, the United States was going to move on these lines in Panama, does it mean, by implication, that the Government of India will condone a similar invasion by the United States of America on behalf of a treaty obligation which the United States of America has with Pakistan? If not, what is the guarantee that the Government of India has been able to obtain that this kind of an intervention will not be replicated to the disadvantage of India in its sensitive borders? Finally, our Foreign Minister was Indian Ambassador to the Soviet Union. We have seen the reaction of the Soviet Union to this intervention. Does it mean that we have started taking a stand different from what the non-aligned movement in general, and the Soviet Union in particular, takes with regard to such acts of aggression?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now Mr. Gopalsamy.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He has been briefed by Mr. Jethmalani.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I need not be briefed by anybody. If you want, I will brief you and I will brief others there...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: The Minister's reply is more important.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will call one more Member from the left and that is all.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Madhya Pradesh): Don't allow repetition. There is too much of repetition.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: If the Government has surrendered to the United States, the question is: Why?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: This Government has taken the right stand deploring the action of the United States in intervening in the internal affairs of Panama. We have taken the correct stand. I would

like to know from the External Affairs Minister whether this Government has verified the authenticity of the reports that appeared in the press that Mr. Noriega was involved in narcotic drug trafficking, that he was a narcotic drug pedlar. But I would like to know from the honourable Minister: Is it because Svenska originates from Panama and it has got 40 crores from Bofors deal? Is that so? Noriega protected the interests of certain people. Is it for that reason that certain people are more interested in protecting Noriega? This is what I would like to know from the honourable Minister.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA (Delhi): Madam, I think the clarifications being asked of the External Affairs Minister have come to the central point and it is the central point which the honourable Minister must answer, whether this is an intervention or this is an invasion And I think my honourable colleague, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, would also be interested to know what the Government of India's stand is going to be on this issue and what stand the Government of India is going to take at the United Nations, whether any initiative is going to be taken by the Government of India. The second point that I would like to seek a clarification on is this. The Minister has been silent on the number of Indians in Panama, although the fighting is taking place right next to the Chancery. Have any arrangements been made by the Government of India to take care of the Indians if they get into trouble, and is evacuation possible?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now Mrs. Pratibha Patil, the previous Deputy Chairman, will be the last speaker.

THAKUR JAGATPAL SINGH (Madhya Pradesh): We would also like to ask clarifications from the Minister. This is an important matter concerning the foreign policy of the country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Everybody's opinion is being heard, from this side, from that side. Now, do you want to hear the Minister's reply or do you not want to hear his reply?

श्री भुवनेश चतुर्वेदी (राजस्थान) : हम सवाल नहीं पूछेंगे । वाजपेयी जी सवाल पूछेंगे वही हमारा सवाल हो जायेगा । (**व्यवधान**)

THAKUR JAGATPAL SINGH: Madam, I want clarifications only on two points, two vital points, arising out of the statement of the Minister of External Affairs. I want to know whether you want to be the spokesman of a particular country or you want to be an independent country or not... (*Interruptions*)...This is what I want to know.

उपसभापति : आप सवाल पूछ लें, वे जवाब दे देंगे ।

SHRIMATI PRATIBHA DEVISINGH PATIL (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, instead of giving our strong reaction to the blatant invasion made by a superpower on such a small country, Panama, paragraph 3 of the Government's statement says that the Government of India has been deeply concerned at the US armed intervention in Panama and deplores the action and that they also regret that the action had led to loss of innocent lives in Panama.

I want to know whether this is the internal feeling of the External Affairs Minister. I also want to know whether any written statement to the effect of condemning this blatant invasion has been sent by the Government of India to the US Government and, if so, I would like to know the text of this communication.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi.

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : आप औरों को समय दे रही हैं । मैंने नाम दिया है, लेकिन आप मुझे नहीं बुला रही हैं ।

उपसभापति : आपको भी समय देंगे ।

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : मैंने सबसे पहले नाम दिया है, आप औरों को बुला रही

[श्री रामचन्द्र विकल]

हैं, यह हमको बर्दाश्त नहीं है । जो वहां चला जाता है, आप उसको समय देती हैं। हमारे यहां बैठने का कोई महत्व नहीं है ।

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to ask only a very few pointed questions.

Madam, I would like to know from the honourable Minister what brief they had given to our Representative at the United Nations, our Representative at the UN Bureau, or whether there was no brief at all from the Ministry of External Affairs.

Secondly, I would like to ask the Minister whether any protest has been lodged with the US Government by the Government of India, the Ministry of External Affairs. The whole House has deplored it. They have deplored the US action and we now deplore the statement of the Minister. Madam, I would urge upon the Minister to withdraw this statement totally, looking to the sentiments of the Indian people and their own policy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Bhandare.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Madam Deputy Chairman, the next time when you are restricting the number of speakers, you kindly tell in advance.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, I thought of doing so and I am going to do that.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: But you give us notice. I am sayaing this because you told me that my name was there. Otherwise, I would not mind your restricting the number of speakers. You have called me now and, therefore, I thank you.

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : आप अब नाम भेज रहे हैं, क्यों बोलते हैं आप ? आपने बाद में नाम दिया है ।

श्री मुरलीधर चन्द्रकांत भंडारे : मैंने तो नाम दिया है ।

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : आपने नाम क्यों दिया है । आपने बाद में नाम दिया है । हम सुबह से यहां बैठे हुए हैं । वहां भी ज्यादती हो रही है ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you misbehave in the House. I will not allow. Please sit down. Yes, Mr: Bhandare.

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : यह ज्यादती की पराकाष्ठा है । मैं नेता, विरोधी दल से कहना चाहता हूं कि यह पक्षपातपूर्ण रवैया होगा । हमने सबसे पहले नाम दिया है, लेकिन दूसरों को बोलने दिया जा रहा है। यह चेयर के लिए शोभा की बात नहीं है ।

उपसभापति : आपको जो कुछ कहना हो, आप लाबी में जाकर कहिये । यहां हाउस की गरिमा को खराब मत कीजिए ।

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : हाउस में ज्यादती होगी तो हम कहां जाएंगे । मैं आपसे पहले राज्य सभा में आया हूं, आप जैसों को बहुतों को देखा है... (**व्यवधान**) ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Don't do it in the House. Go out and do it in the Lobby. Yes, Mr. Bhandare. आप अपने लफ्ज वापस लीजिये । आपकी उम्र का यह मतलब नहीं है कि आपको चेयर के साथ बदतमीजी की इजाजत है ।

You please take your words back.

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : यह ज्यादती की पराकाष्ठा है । बुजुर्गी को डिस्क्वालिफाई कर दिया गया है । मैं नहीं रहना चाहता हूं ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhandare, you please speak now.. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Madam...

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : मैं जा रहा हूं, मैं नहीं रहना चाहता हूं ।

[At this stage, the honourable Member left the Chamber.]

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Madam, let me confess that I find this statement as weak as the Government itself is. In fact, I had not expected anything better. I have seen over the last fortnight since this Government has come that there is a deliberate attempt not to mention Jawaharlalji anywhere. It gives me a lot of anguish because even if they try to forget Jawaharlalji, we cannot forget and the nation cannot forget that Jawaharlalji, has been the architect of the foreign policy of our nation. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Did the former Prime Minister ever remember Mahatma Gandhi?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Therefore, I find that this statement is a direct result of adopting a totally weekened policy. I do not have to say more because it has been so very ably expressed by my colleagues almost from all sections of this House. I want to emphasise one thing. In the present circumstances, if any nation wants any chang in any other nation, the time for aggresion is over. The well spring for that change must come from within. We are seeing what is happening in a great part of Europe and in other countries. The whole system is breaking down and there is an emergence of democratic and human rights values. I hope that in his answer at least the Minister will be strong enough to say that we most unequivocally condemn this naked aggression by U.S.A. and we call for immediate withdrawal of the forces and that no efforts will be spared by this great nation to uphold the policy of Jawaharlalji, to uphold the policy of Indiraji and to see that the policy of non-alignment is spread to protect smaller and weaker nations. Thank you.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am asking questions only. Madam, the statement by the hon. External Affairs Minister is quite contradictory. Each paragraph contradicts the other. I would like to say that the Government has not openly come out as to what their foreign policy is. Secondly, the present Government is a minority Government. (*Interruptions*) I do not know. It has been admitted by the Prime Minister himself. Are they contradicting it? I would like to know whether they have mortgaged the Government of India and this country to the United States. Moreover, I would like to say that this Government has no political will to say anything about their foreign policy. Madam, the previous Government whether it was headed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru ... (*Interruptions*) I am not going to Sri Lanka. You can keep quiet.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: Even in Sri Lanka they have surrendered to the United States.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: At the time of our former Prime Minister Indiraji and also Rajiv Gandhi, when Afghanistan was invaded, we made it very clear to the Soviet Union, although it is our friendly country, that our Government will not tolerate it and the troops have to be withdrawn. Madam, you will see that the present Government has said that they hope and pray that the troops will be withdrawn. But they are not condemning the attuitude of the American Government in invading Panama. Apart from that, the present Government which is now ruling this country, is saying that the internal affairs of Panama are confusing. When the present Government itself is in a confusing state of mind, they are saying the situation is confusing.

Madam, therefore I would like to know one thing from the Minister. The invasion took place, according to them at about 1130 hours yesterday, and the sta-

[Shri V. Narayanasamy]

tement is issued now. But the Government's statement is a very shabby statement. The Government spokesman have not condemned it. What was the reason? Why have they been keeping quiet? Why has this Government been keeping quiet for more than 36 years without condemning the attitude of the US while they have been invading Panama? And I would like to know...

SHRI ASHIS SEN (West Bengal): You speak loudly. There is a mike.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: You advise your other leader Mr. Dipen Ghosh about it. Then come to me.

Secondly, Madam, I want to know whether they have received any report from the Embassy about the incident. What is the reaction of the Government of India in this regard?

Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thakur Jagatpal Singh

ठाकुर जगतपाल सिंह: मन्त्री जी के स्टेटमेंट को देख कर मुझे बहुत दुख हुआ। मुझे कुछ पुरानी यादें आईं कि हमारी विदेश नीति जो हिन्दुस्तान की बनी थी जिसके कारण हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ दुनियां के लोग देखते थे। जो अत्याचार करता है उसके खिलाफ हम बोलते रहे। मैं प्रेजीडेंट एड्रेस पर चर्चा के समय बताऊंगा कि क्या हुआ है। यह जो खतरा था वह खतरा हमारे सामने आ गया। इस स्टेटमेंट में दो बातें कही गई हैं। मैं मन्त्री जी का बहुत आदर करता हूं। मैं समझता था कि आप इस देश की नान-अलाइनमेंट की पालिसी को जिन्दा रखेंगे लेकिन मुझे यह दिखाई दिया कि एक स्पोक्समेन की तरह आपने यह स्टेटमेंट दिया है।

उपसभापति : ठाकुर साहब आप सवाल कीजिये।

ठाकुर जगतपाल सिंह: मैं सीधा क्वाइंट यह रखना चाहता हूं कि यह इनवेजन है या नहीं है, यह एग्रेशन है या नहीं ? (**व्यवधान**) आपने अपनी इम्बेसी से पूछा है या नहीं और जिस पर हमला हुआ है क्या उससे भी पूछा है या नहीं या अमरीकन स्पोक्समेन हो कर स्टेटमेंट दिया है। मुझे इतना ही पूछना है। इब्तदाए इश्क है रोता है क्या, आगे आगे देखिये होता है क्या। धन्यवाद।

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : उपसभापति महोदया, यह जो वक्तव्य सदन के सामने विदेश मन्त्री श्री गुजराल जी ने दिया है यह संदिग्ध है और उसमें संदिग्धपन की जो बात है वह उनके आंकड़ों से जाहिर है। एक तो कितना नरसंहार हुआ उसके आंकड़े नहीं दिये हैं। उनका यह वक्तव्य है कि गलियों में युद्ध हो रहा है। इन्होंने 13 हजार सैनिक को 10 हजार सैनिक बताया और वह काट दिया है (**व्यवधान**) यह तो दाढ़ी में तिनका नजर आता है। इसलिए सन्देह उत्पन्न होता है काटने से थोड़ा चल जाएगा 13 हजार भेजे गये या 10 हजार भेजे गये (**व्यवधान**)

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : काट दिया तो काट दिया।

श्री रामचन्द्र विकल : क्यों काटा गया यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं। दूसरा यह संदिग्ध है आंकड़े सही नहीं हैं। जितना नरसंहार हुआ है हमारे देश की जनता चिन्तित है सारा संसार चिन्तित है सरकार को भी उतनी चिन्ता करनी चाहिये। मैं अपने कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों से कहूंगा कि सरकार को कंधा उतना दो कि आपका कन्धा दुखे नहीं। मैं यह कह रहा था कि इसमें आंकड़े साफ नहीं हैं कि कितनी सेना वहां पर है कितना नरसंहार हो रहा है। अनेक देशों ने इसका विरोध किया है। बड़े तगड़े शब्दों में किया है 7.00 PM और लन्दन ने इसका समर्थन किया है, यह रेडियो में सुबह हमने सुना। भारत सरकार इसके बारे में क्या कर रही है, समर्थन है या विरोध है, यह इस वक्तव्य से स्पष्ट नहीं है। आपको स्पष्ट करना पड़ेगा... (**व्यवधान**) दूसरा यह है कि जो हमारी गुट निरपेक्ष देश की नीति है उस पर यह वक्तव्य खरा नहीं उतरा रहा है। साथ

ही मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि यू० एन०ओ० में इस सवाल को ले जाने के लिए भारत सरकार तैयार है या नहीं। जो मानव संहार वहां हो रहा है उसको गुट निरपेक्ष देशों के सम्मेलन में ले जाना चाहते हैं या नहीं। गुरुपदस्वामी जी सफाई देने तो खड़े हुए पर सफाई खरी नहीं आई, कोशिश तो की उन्होंने। वे भी आत्मविश्वास से नहीं बोल रहे थे। मुझे लगता है कि ये आत्मविश्वास खो चुके हैं। इस सच्चाई को स्पष्ट करना चाहिए, भारत की विदेश नीति की दृष्टि से नहीं तो वहां जो मानव संहार हो रहा है उस मानवता की दृष्टि से ही कम से कम। मैं इंदिरा जी का एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूं। वे अमेरिका में गयी थी अनाज के अभाव में सन् 1965 में, अमेरिका के लोगों ने कुछ दस्तखत कराने चाहे भारत के स्वाभिमान को खोकर, वे आज दुनियां में नहीं हैं लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि उन्होंने वहीं अमेरिका में कह दिया और आप यहां बैठे बैठे डर रहे हैं, उन्होंने अमेरिका में जाकर कह दिया मैं अपने देश का स्वाभिमान बेचने नहीं आई हूं, मैं देश के किसानों, मजदूरों को भूखे पेट रहने की बात कह सकती हूं पर अमेरिका में आकर स्वाभिमान बेचकर नहीं जाऊंगी... (व्यवधान) आप यहां डर रहे हैं। यह बात कहने को तैयार नहीं हैं। नर संहार हो रहा है या युद्ध, कहने को तैयार नहीं हैं। आपने वहां भेजा क्या, यह भी नहीं बताया। आपने विरोध का स्वरूप क्या दिया है अमेरिका की गवर्नमेंट को, यह भी स्पष्ट नहीं है। आप उस विरोध को स्पष्ट कीजिए कि क्या करना चाहते हैं और इस पर दुबारा कल तक एक बहस हो जाये मेरी यह मांग है और शायद सदन भी चाहेगा कि इस पर बहस हो... (व्यवधान) वाजपेयी जी के विचार जरूर सुने जायें यह भी मैं जरुर कहना चाहता हूं... (व्यवधान) कभी तो होगा।

श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलुवालिया: महोदया, आज का दिन दो हिस्सों में बटा हुआ है एक तो दुर्भाग्य का है और एक सौभाग्य का। सौभाग्य का इसलिए है कि आज ही हमने संविधान में संशोधन करके हमारे मुल्क की पिछड़ी जातियों को 10 साल के लिए और रिजरवेशन देने की बात की और बड़े बड़े भाषण हुए। पर दुख उस वक्त होता है कि हमारे मुल्क के विदेश मंत्रालय के मंत्री आई० के० गुजराल साहब जो कि अपने आपको सिविल लिबर्टीज और ह्यूमन राइट्स का चैम्पियन कहते रहे हैं और अभी कुछ दिन पहले तक उन्होंने बड़े बड़े प्लेटफार्म पर सिविल लिबर्टीज और ह्यूमन राइट्स की बात कही और उसी को लेकर... मैं क्वेश्चन पर भी आऊंगा, आप परेशान क्यों हैं ....आपको याद दिलाना पड़ता हैं, आपकी स्मरण शक्ति कमजोर हैं इसलिए याद दिलाना पड़ता है कि कुछ दिन पहले तक चुनाव लड़ने तक इन्होंने सिविल लिबर्टीज और ह्यूमन राइट्स की बात कही लेकिन आज क्यों हिचकिचाते हैं जब पनामा पर सिर्फ 22 लाख की पापूलेशन पर 22 करोड़ जनता ने अपने सैनिक भेजे और कितने लोगों को बचाने के लिए, जहां तक मैं जानता हूं पूरे पनामा में सिर्फ 25 हजार अमेरिकन्स रहते हैं... (व्यवधान) उन 25 हजार अमेरिकनों की रक्षा के लिए 23 हजार सैनिक भेजे गये और उस 23 हजार की संख्या को छिपाने के लिए भारत सरकार ने एक नयी कोशिश की कि लिखे हुए को उस विभाग ने जिसने स्टेटमेंट बनाया, कलम से काट दिया कि 23 हजार सैनिकों का भी पता न लगे। दुर्भाग्य इस बात का है। गौतम, महावीर और नानक की भूमि से अहिंसा के पुजारियों की भूमि से इतना भी कहकर नहीं गुजरते। 22 लाख जनता पर 22 करोड़ का यह जो हस्तक्षेप है यह जो अत्याचार है, अविचार है इसके खिलाफ आवाज नहीं निकल रही है। शर्म की बात है। महोदया, मैं आपके माध्यम से विदेश मंत्री से गुजारिश करना चाहता हूं कि कड़े से कड़े शब्दों, कड़े से कड़े अल्फाजों को लिखकर इसका विरोध किया जाये और अमेरिका को बताया जाये कि यह पनामा

[श्री सुरेन्द्रजीत सिंह अहलूवालिया]

की जनता, 22 लाख जनता की आवाज नहीं है, सारा विश्व इसके खिलाफ आवाज उठा रहा है, आवाज बुलंद कर रहा है और भारतीय संसद उसका अनुमोदन करती है। महोदया, अभी तक यह जो बता रहे हैं कि वहां के हाई कमीशन से बात करके पता लग रहा है कि वहां की गलियों में लड़ाई चल रही है और उस लड़ाई में कितने लोग मारे गये, उस लड़ाई में वहां के कितने लोगों का नुकसान हुआ और अब तक जो सिर्फ 25 हजार अमेरिकनों की संख्या है उसको अपने कब्जे में उन 23 हजार सैनिकों ने लिया है या नहीं या यह सिर्फ एक बहाना था वहां पर अपना अधिपत्य जमाने का अमेरिकन्स का। इसका क्या विचार करती है भारतीय सरकार और भारतीय सरकार ने सेक्यूर्टी कौंसिल में अपना क्या स्टेंड लेने का फैसला लिया है, यू.एन.ओ. में इस पर आवाज उठाने के लिए भारत सरकार ने क्या फैसला लिया है?

भारत सरकार क्या अविलंब अमरीका को अपनी फौजें वापिस लेने के लिए अनुरोध कर रही है या नहीं? अगर नहीं कर रही है, तो भारतीय संसद इसके बारे में विचार करने के लिए तत्पर है कि नहीं, प्रस्तुत है कि नहीं? धन्यवाद।

उपसभापति: रत्नाकर पाण्डेय जी, आप भी सवाल ही पूछिये।

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: माननीय उपसभापति जी, विदेश मंत्री जी ने जो पनामा और अमरीका के संबंध में वक्तव्य सदन के सामने रखा है, यह इस सरकार की दीवालिया मनोवृत्ति का द्योतक है। जैसे मेरे बहुत से साथियों ने कहा कि तेईस हजार सैनिक वहां गये हैं, पच्चीस हजार अमेरीकन वहां रहते हैं और ऊपर की लाईन काटी है कि जनरल मैनुअल अंतोनियो नोरिएगा को हिरासत में लिया जा सके, पनामा केनाल संधि की अखंडता बनाई जा सके, लोकतांत्रिक प्रक्रिया बहाल की जा सके और वहां रहने वाले अमरीकियों को सुरक्षा प्रदान की जा सके।

हमारे विरोधी दल के नेता ने शुरू में ही साफ कहा है कि अमरीकी सैनिक हस्तक्षेप शीघ्र समाप्त होगा और अमरीकी सेनाओं को शीघ्र हटा दिया जाएगा। मैडम, इसी सदन में उस तरफ से मैंने कहा था कि इस सदन के एक माननीय सदस्य अमरीका गये थे और वहां पर उन्होंने भारत को दी जाने वाली सहायता को... (**व्यवधान**) सुनिये, यह हंसने की बात नहीं है... (**व्यवधान**)

आपका विदेश मंत्री क्या कहेगा। जो प्रधान मंत्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू और इन्दिरा गांधी की विदेश नीतियों का नाम नहीं लेता है, उसके फारेन एफेयर्ज मिनिस्टर की क्या नीति है, यह क्लियर करें। यह सर्वोच्च सदन मजाक की जगह नहीं है। *

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Madam, on a point of order. (*Interruptions*) The hon. Member just now said ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has not gone on record.

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: Yes, I will prove it. (*Interruptions*) Mr. leader. I will prove it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I take strong objection to this. (*Interruptions*) This is not the type of language I expect from the Opposition, (*Interruptions*) He must be very careful in using his words. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pandey, do not use such words.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: I request you to expunge these words.

*Not recorded.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has not gone on record. (*Interruptions*)

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: सहायता बंद करवाई और वी०पी० सिंह को प्रधान मंत्री और रामकृष्ण हेगडे को डिप्टी प्रधान मंत्री बनाने के लिए आया वह ..... (**व्यवधान**) आज हारे हुए राम कृष्ण हेगडे को योजना आयोग का अध्यक्ष बनाया गया है। ... (**व्यवधान**)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pandey, do not mention anybody's name who is not present in the House.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: महोदया, मैं आपकी चेयर का आदर करता हूं। .... (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Please control him. (*Interruptions*).

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैडम, मैं जानना चाहता हूं, स्टेटमेंट में कहा गया है कि पनामा मे रहने वाले भारतीय राष्ट्रिकों का जहां तक संबंध है उनकी जान-हानि की कोई भी खबर हमारे मिशन को अभी तक प्रकट नहीं हुई है। ..... (**व्यवधान**)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not going on record. (*Interruptions*). Just a minute. What he said which is objectionable has not gone on record. I have allowed him to ask the questions only from the External Affairs Minister. Beyond that nothing is going on record.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: He should apologise.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: मैं जानता हूं कि कितने भारतीय वहां पर हैं और उन भारतीयों की सुरक्षा के लिए अमरीका को समर्थन करने वाली वी० पी० सिंह की सरकार के विदेश मंत्री हमारे भारतीयों की रक्षा के लिए क्या उपाय करने वाले हैं, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Is this the culture which he has nurtured from your party, Mr. Shiv Shanker? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: That has not gone on record.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: When Shri Gurudas Das Gupta talked of CIA you did not control him and now want to control Shri Ratnakar Pandey. Why should this double standard be practised?

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Now let us listen to the Minister's reply. Everybody wanted to know about this.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Madam Deputy Chairman, I share the sentiments of this House and I respect them because I think in totality we express the sentiments of this country. I do believe and feel that what has happened in Panama is highly deplorable.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Will you kindly yield? If you do not yield, that is a different thing. (*Interruptions*). I am making a request to the Minister to yield, to listen to me.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am not yielding. My hon. friend Mr. Shiv Shanker and my hon. friend Mr. Chavan have hed this portfoio for a whie and at least their memory should be fresher than that of the other Members.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am sorry, Mr. Minister...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am not yielding. I would also request them to kindly recall what words were used by the Government of India in the similar circumstances in the past. If your memory is not holding, I would be very happy to show you the files whenever you like.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am not on that question. Just allow me to ask a question. After all, I am entitled to know from you. You have said something and I am entitled to know from you...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have not said something, Let me finish. I am not yielding. I want to finish.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: May I just make one submission? I am seeking permission from the Chair.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am not yielding.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: You may not yield. I am asking the Chair to allow me.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: When I am not yielding how can you ask a question? You have had your say already.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: What is this? This is very unfair for the Government. We have always yielded whenever you have asked a question. I am entitled to it and you do not even yield for a minute. I am seeking the permission of the Chair. (*Interruptions*). What is it? If you do not want us to be here, we will go away. We would categorically like to know as to what the view of the Government is. We have categorically asked whether you admit that this is an invasion or not, whether you condemn it as an invasion or not.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Let me finish my statement. I promise you that I will not go away without answering your each and every question. That I promise. But kindly listen to me for a minute.

If you kindly listen to me...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: We would request you to straightway answer this query--whether you consider it to be an invasion or not.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I will not answer that. I will not be bullied like this.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: It is not bullying. It is a clarification which we are seeking. And if you would not like to correct yourself to call this as an "invasion", I would like to submit that this is a departure from our accredited national policy, it is an insult to our nation and in protest we walk out.

(*At this stage, some hon. Members left the chamber*).

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Madam, this is very unfair. Only a few minutes back, the hon. Members in the Lok Sabha unanimously reposed confidence in this Government and the same party is walking out while the Minister is replying to the clarifications sought by them.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is entirely their prerogative. They can do what they like. The Chair has got nothing to do with it. Anybody can walk in and walk out.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Madam Chairperson, I was submitting and I want to submit again, and I am really sorry that our hon. friends have thought it fit not to listen to the replies that they had asked for. I say this thing clearly. We unequivocally say that the US action is highly deplorable. Not only is it higher deplorable, but we have said in the statement and I re-state it that they must withdraw forthwith. The foreign forces have no business to be in that country and therefore, I feel that this voice of the House must unanimously go out to say that India feels concerned about it and India feels that no country howsoever powerful and howsoever big, has any right to intervene i nothers affairs. This has been our policy, not today but all the time.

My dear friend, Mr. Bhandare, who has also left, had mentioned the name of Jawaharlalji. Jawaharalalji is a highly respectable name, not only to any party but to the entire country. I cannot think that without Nehru there could have been a foreign policy for Iidia and I bow my head in respect to him because we, and particularly I personally also, have all learnt what Nehru has taught us and therefore if India is a proud country today, much of it we owe to Jawaharlal Nehru. This party of ours is no less or lesser in any way than the ones who claim the hereditary right, in paying our respect and homage to him. Jawaharlalji had authored and given us the idea of non-alignment. We completely, wholeheartedly and with all respect say that we are committed to non-alignment. Non-alignment is the anchor-sheet of India's foreign policy and particularly of our party. Therefore there should be no doubt in that.

A question was asked why a few words have been cut and deleted and I think I should explain that. They were cut and deleted because the situation is fast changing, the figures are changing and by the time they were preparing the statement, the figures where already changing. Therefore, I thought it would be unfair on my part to give figures to the House which would be outdated by the time they are read. As it is, the invasion is going on. War is going on. Some friends had asked me to let them know how many casualties have taken place. Obviously when war is going on, these figures are not available. But we keep our eyes and ears open and our Embassy is trying to ascertain facts. Up till now what we have been told is that the situation is continuing and therefore we are unable to state this. But one thing I can say, up till now we are not aware of any Indian having suffered. Well, I do not know how the situation will change because the situation is changing very fast and it is very unfortunate.

A question has also been asked as to why I quoted the US. spokesman in the statement. Well, I quoted him not because we agree with it, not that we endorse it, not that in any case we see any justification for it. I wanted the House to know what they have tried to say. Therefore, it must not be misunderstood in that context. Government of India--I may repeat and I think strong words have been used and if I may also use strong words, but not as strong as were used here--stands and can stand up to anybody, to any pressure. We represent an independent, sovereign State of which we are proud. Therefore, whether it is that party or this party which is in power today, we have to uphold the dignity and the sovereignty of this country. We have said in the past, and we will continue to say what our policies are. And our policies are against all intervention by any outside power in any country. Therefore, I want to repeat that the intervention in Panama is highly deplorable and I feel and hope that the Security Council would meet soon to take charge of it. In New York, only some hours ago the Non-Aligned Forum has met. We are a part of that and we have also moved, along with other non-aligned forces and Non-Aligned Forum members, to see that the Security Council is activated and takes charge of the situation.

A point has been made as to why the US official came to meet the Prime Minister. My friends have gone...

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I have asked it. I am here.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I would like you to come here! Madam, I may tell him that this is not for the first time that a Government official from America of that level came and it is also not for the first time that the Prime Minister has received him.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: But I didn't ask this question. I said, is it within protocol? I don't care what the previous Government did. I said, he has the rank of a Joint Secretary. How can you have him meet the Prime Minister? Would a Joint Secretary of the Government of India be allowed to meet the President of the United States?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sometimes, officials come as special envoys and when they come as special envoys, their office does not bear testimony to the type of message they want to convey. And he had come, primarily, to brief the Prime Minister and us about the Malta summit, and with a special message to give their understanding of the Malta summit. Therefore, I don't think we should be worried much about that.

Now, I need not repeat that para 3 and para 5 are very clear so far as our position is concerned. I must say that I am sorry, my friend, Mr. Salve, has gone. I am really happy to say that, after all, they have got back their tongue: It was silent for a long time! And I appreciate this.

I would only say this thing to end: I hope the Security Council will meet very soon, as it should, and I hope all the non-aligned countries will put their heads together and take a joint stand and we endorse it.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: One question.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: A question was asked, how many Indian people are in Panama? So far as we know, there are about 2,000 people of Indian origin. Some of them may be having pass-ports also. We are trying to get the facts. Therefore, I am unable to state more categorically on this. I hope, with this, I have covered almost all the points.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: There is one point. I asked, how many countries have condemned the action of the United States? Have you any information on that?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: No. Every country has used different adjectives.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: The word "condemn"?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: According to whatever data I have got, the word "condemn" has been used only by two countries as yet. But it is a changing situation and, therefore, countries may be changing the adjectives that they want to use.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Which are those countries?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: So far as I know, I think it is Nicaragua and one more. I will have to go through the papers for that. But, by and large, whether the word "condemn" is used or the word "deplorable" is used, the fact remains that we all strongly protest against intervention in the internal affairs of an independent, sovereign country.

Thank you very much.

Allocation of time for Disposal of Government Legislative Business

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held today, the 21st December 1989, allotted time for Government Legislative business as follows:—

Business	Time Allotted
Consideration and passing/return of the following Bills :	
(1) The Criminal Law Amendment (Amending) Bill, 1989.	1 hour
(2) The Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1989.	2 hours
(3) The Appropriation Bill relating to Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for 1989-90.	2 hours

The Committee also recommended that the House should sit up to 6.00 p.m. daily and beyond 6.00 p.m. as and when necessary for the transaction of Government business. The House is adjourned adjournd till 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at at twenty-five minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 22nd December 1989.